

Remarks

Reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims, in view of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

In the pending Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as allegedly being anticipated by Nakazawa '746; and rejected claims 8-9, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Nakazawa '746 in view of Ying '956. The Examiner also objected to the Abstract.

By this Amendment, the Specification and Abstract as well as claims 1-6 have been amended. In addition, claims 7-9 have been cancelled and no new matter has been introduced. As such, claims 1-6, are currently presented for examination of which claims 1-3 are independent.

Applicant submits that, by virtue of the changes to the Abstract, the objection thereto has been overcome. Accordingly, the immediate withdrawal of the objection to the Abstract is respectfully requested.

Applicant traverses the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections for the following reasons:

I. Rejections Under §102(b) & §103(a).

As noted above, independent claim 1 positively recites, *inter alia*, an operation state switching unit which is disposed at the electrical apparatus side for switching an operation state of the electrical apparatus independent of operation in the operation unit wherein the *electrical apparatus is arranged so that an operation state thereof in power activation is changeable into a plurality of stages* and the operation state switching unit is rendered operable via the communication control unit when a remotely-operated terminal executes an over-the-horizon communication with the communication control unit.

Applicant submits that none of the asserted references, whether taken alone or in combination, suggest each and every element of claim 1 including, for example, the features noted above. In particular, the Examiner asserted that Nakazawa '746 discloses that the

operation state of the electrical apparatus during power activation is changeable into a plurality of stages. (See, Office Action: page 4). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Nakazawa '746 merely discloses a configuration in which vibration sensor 60 transmits a vibration detection report to a host unit 100, after detecting a vibration of a predetermined strength or higher. The host unit 100 then turns on a light to prevent confusion at the time of refuge. (See, Nakazawa '746: column 18, lines 53 to 64).

Applicant submits that such a configuration suggests nothing regarding the changeability of the operation state of an electrical apparatus during power activation. As such, Nakazawa '746 fails to suggest *electrical apparatus is arranged so that an operation state thereof in power activation is changeable into a plurality of stages*, as required by claim 1.

Applicant further submits that the remaining reference, Ying '956, is incapable of curing the deficiencies of Nakazawa '746 noted above.

Similarly, independent claim 2 positively recites, *inter alia*, the operation state switching unit is rendered operable via the communication control unit when a remotely-operated terminal executes an over-the-horizon communication with the communication control unit, and *after receiving a command to change the operation state of the electrical apparatus from the remote operation terminal, the communication control unit is capable of executing the instructions when a predetermined condition is met*.

The Examiner alleged that Nakazawa '746 discloses that an operation state of an electrical apparatus is changed upon receipt of a command from a remote control terminal and the command is carried out when a predetermined condition is met. (See, Office Action: page 5). More specifically, the Examiner asserted that Nakazawa '746, in column 5, lines 13 to 18, teaches that the apparatus may comprise a plurality of sensors for detecting motion, fire hazard, and the like and that electricity is prevented from being wasted due to devices that have not been turned off during the nighttime, or a fire can be prevented from arising because of electricity that has inadvertently been left on.

Applicant points out, however, that Nakazawa '746 merely discloses that host unit 300 transmits a signal to a terminal unit 200 to turn off the power supply when a sensor 64 detects that there is no person in a room. Upon receipt of the signal, the terminal unit 200 turns off the corresponding apparatus.

So, according to this configuration, the Nakazawa '746 apparatus is powered off when no person is in the room during the night. That is, host unit 300 delivers the power-off signal *without any determination by the terminal unit 200 as to whether a predetermined condition is met*. Thus, when host unit 300 delivers a power-off signal, the apparatus is merely powered off upon receipt of the signal. As such, Nakazawa '746 clearly fails to suggest *after receiving a command to change the operation state of the electrical apparatus from the remote operation terminal, the communication control unit is capable of executing the instructions when a predetermined condition is met*, as required by independent claim 2.

Applicant submits that the remaining reference, Ying '956, is incapable of curing the deficiencies of Nakazawa '746 noted above.

With regard to independent claim 3, the claim positively recites, *inter alia*, the *detecting units are disposed on a plurality of electrical apparatuses for detecting a state of consumed power for each of the electrical apparatuses and the communication control unit is capable of controlling the state of consumed power for each of the electrical apparatuses*, and when a sum total of the state of consumed power informed by the detecting units exceeds an upper limit value, the communication control unit controls so that the consumed power is reduced from the electrical apparatus with a lower priority sequence or stops the operation of the electrical apparatus so that the sum total is limited within an upper limit power and the *communication control unit sets the priority sequence of the electrical apparatus whose operation state has been changed latest to lowest and so that the priority sequence becomes higher as the time of change of the operation state goes back farther*.

The Examiner alleged that Ying '956 discloses that a plurality of wireless energy control units are provided with switching banks for controlling power supply to electrical loads in local areas, respectively and that each unit determines is capable of specifying the order or priority in which electrical loads are disengaged. (See, Office Action: pages 7-8). The Examiner also alleged that Ying '956 further discloses that a priority order of an electrical apparatus whose power consumption is lowest is changed to a higher priority order according to an operation state at that time and the collective operation of the local energy control units at their various remote locations, whereupon a substantial overall power reduction can be realized. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

To the point, there is absolutely nothing in Ying '956 that suggests that the electrical apparatus whose operation state has been changed latest to lowest and so that ***the priority sequence becomes higher as the time of change of the operation state goes back farther,*** as required by independent claim 3.

Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that independent claims 1-3 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by asserted references. As such, claims 1-3 are clearly patentable. And, because claims 4-6 depend from any of claims 1-3, respectively, claims 4-6 are patentable at least by virtue of dependency as well as for their additional recitations.

Accordingly, the immediate withdrawal of the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Date: June 30, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By:


E. Rico Hernandez
Registration No. 47,641

Customer No. 00909

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, Virginia 22102
Main: 703-770-7900
Direct Dial: 703-770-7788
Fax: 703-770-7901